



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,233

01/13/2004

Poul Egon Bertelsen

55682CON(71432)

5334

21874

7590

09/01/2009

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

SASAN, ARADHANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/758,233	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BERTELSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ARADHANA SASAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ARADHANA SASAN. (3) COLLEEN McKIERNAN.

(2) MICHAEL WOODWARD. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 27 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 68.

Identification of prior art discussed: Melia et al. (Ailment. Pharmacol. Therap. (1989) 3, 513-525. Remington's (16<sup>th</sup> edition (1980), Lieberman et al. (Pharmaceutical Dosage Forms).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presented arguments regarding the difference between API size and granule size and that Melia teaches API particles not particulate granules of a specific size. Applicant's representative will consider filing a response and a request for reconsideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aradhana Sasan/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615	/MP WOODWARD/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615
---	---